

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-35 are presented for examination.

Specification Objections

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claims subject matter in claims 19-28. These objections are traversed.

The Federal Circuit allowed the following preamble in *In re Beauregard*: "A computer readable medium having instructions for causing a computer to execute a method, comprising:" {See *In re Beauregard*, 53 F.3d 1583 (Fed. Cir. 1995)}. Claims 19-28 are amended to recite "A computer readable storage medium having instructions for causing a computer to execute a method."

In view of the amendments to claims 19-28, Applicants respectfully ask the examiner to withdraw the objections.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-8, 11-23, 26-32, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2004/0243616 (Benhase) in view of US publication number 2004/0093361 (Therrien). Claims 9, 24, and 33 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2004/0243616 (Benhase) in view of US publication number 2004/0093361 (Therrien) and USPN 6,832,248 (Byrnes). Claims 10, 25, and 34 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication number 2004/0243616 (Benhase) in view of US publication number 2004/0093361 (Therrien) and USPN 6,832,248 (Byrnes) and US publication number 2005/0039123 (Kuchinsky). These rejections are traversed.

The claims recite one or more elements that are not taught or suggested in the art of record. These missing elements show that the differences between the combined teachings in the art and the recitations in the claims are great. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

As one example, independent claim 1 recites "toggling between the tree-table view and a table view that shows the storage domain in a table that can be sorted based on attributes to which a column of the table belongs. As another example, independent

claim 8 recites “toggling, in response to a user request, between the tree-table view and a sortable table that corresponds to the table-portion.” The art of record does not teach or suggest these elements.

In paragraph [0042], Benhase uses the word “toggle” to describe toggling between sorts on a same table. Specifically, the user in Benhase clicks on a header or title in a column of the table to toggle between ascending or descending sorts on the column. In contrast to Benhase, the claims recite toggling very differently. For example, claim 1 recites toggling between a tree-table view and a table view. Benhase does not toggle between different one view of a tree-table and another view of a table. Benhase toggles between ascending or descending views of a column in the same table.

The differences between the claims and the teachings in the art are great since the references fail to teach or suggest all of the claim elements. As such, the pending claims are not a predictable variation of the art to one of ordinary skill in the art.

For at least these reasons, the claims are allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529